

**CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL
BOARD
COLORADO RIVER BASIN REGION
2004 TRIENNIAL REVIEW
WORKPLAN**

**Prepared By
Basin Planning Unit
Regional Board Staff**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
2004 TRIENNIAL REVIEW LIST	2
ISSUE 1: BENEFICIAL USE DESIGNATION OF SURFACE WATERS	4
ISSUE 2: BENEFICIAL USE DESIGNATION OF AQUIFERS	5
ISSUE 3: GUIDELINES FOR SEWAGE DISPOSAL FROM LAND DEVELOPMENTS	7
ISSUE 4: REMOVE FECAL COLIFORM MONITORING REQUIREMENT	8
ISSUE 5: RE-EVALUATE LANGUAGE IN THE BASIN PLAN PERTINENT TO THE SALTON SEA.....	9
ISSUE 6: NEW RIVER POLLUTION FROM MEXICO.....	10
ISSUE 7: STANDARDIZE IMPERIAL VALLEY SEDIMENT TMDL IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULES	11
ISSUE 8: DEVELOP REGION-WIDE POLICY FOR DISCHARGES OF AGRICULTURAL WASTEWATER .	12
ISSUE 10: SEDIMENT AND TURBIDITY WATER QUALITY OBJECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION	14
ISSUE 11: DEVELOP WATER QUALITY OBJECTIVES FOR AMMONIA	15
ISSUE 12: DEVELOP WATER QUALITY OBJECTIVES FOR RESIDUAL CHLORINE	16
ISSUE 13: DEVELOP WATER QUALITY OBJECTIVES FOR BIOCRITERIA.....	17
ISSUE 14: CORRECT ERRORS,OUTDATED INFORMATION, AND INCLUDE REFERENCED POLICIES	18
SUMMARY	19

INTRODUCTION

Section 303(c) of the Federal Clean Water Act (CWA) and Section 130 of Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) require that the State hold public hearings to review applicable water quality standards (WQS), and modify and adopt standards as necessary. Water quality standards include beneficial uses and water quality objectives (WQOs). Section 13240 of the California Water Code (CWC) requires the State to formulate and periodically update Regional Water Quality Control Plans (Basin Plans). The Basin Plan is a master-planning document for ground and surface waters in the Region. The Basin Plan has five major components:

1. Identifies the waters of the Region;
2. Designates beneficial uses of those waters;
3. Establishes WQOs for the protection of those uses;
4. Prescribes an implementation plan (i.e., actions to be taken to enforce the WQS); and
5. Establishes a monitoring and surveillance program to assess implementation efforts.

Pursuant to State and Federal regulations, the Regional Board holds public hearings to evaluate WQS and their need for revision at least every three years, hence the term "Triennial Review." The purpose of the Triennial Review is twofold: to identify potential water quality problems/issues, and to reaffirm parts of the Basin Plan where no potential problems are identified. Reviewing Basin Plan and WQS adequacy involves several procedural requirements that are summarized below:

- Prepare a preliminary list of potential water quality concerns (i.e., Triennial Review List);
- Notice a public hearing to review WQS (CWC 13244), adopt the Draft Triennial Review List, and reaffirm parts of the Basin Plan not included in the list as adequate;
- Conduct workshops if necessary, and a Public Hearing;
- Respond to comments identified during the public comment period, and the hearing;
- Finalize the list of potential water quality issues;
- Prepare a workplan to address those issues, including the need for Basin Plan amendments, and resources needed to complete the amendments;
- Adopt a Board Resolution that specifies the findings and intent of the Triennial Review, reaffirms parts of the Basin Plan not included in the Triennial Review List, specifies that the Basin Plan remains in effect in its entirety until amendments are adopted, and terminates the 2004 Triennial Review ; and
- Forward the Board Resolution and hearing record to the State Water Resources Control Board for review and approval.

The review does not necessarily mean that the Basin Plan will be revised. While a major part of the review consists of identifying potential water quality issues, an important part is the reaffirmation of those portions of the Basin Plan where no potential problems are identified.

Regional Board staff notified interested and potentially affected parties of the intent to conduct a Triennial Review in a Public Notice dated November 17, 2004. The Public Notice included a draft list of potential water quality issues for investigation and review.

Regional Board staff revised the Draft 2004 Triennial Review List based on public comment. In a Public Notice dated March 18, 2005, staff notified interested and potentially affected parties of these revisions. The Public Notice also stated the Regional Board's intent to: (a) conduct a

public hearing on May 4, 2005 to review the findings of the 2004 Triennial Review List, (b) adopt the Triennial Review List and Workplan, and (c) terminate the 2004 Triennial Review.

2004 TRIENNIAL REVIEW LIST

The Triennial Review List contains the following issues:

Beneficial Use Designation of Surface Waters:

Conduct region-wide surface water survey to evaluate beneficial uses and water quality standards. Identify standards that require revision, and reaffirm standards that require no revision. Revise the Basin Plan as necessary. This process is part of the reaffirmation requirements for current water quality standards.

Beneficial Use Designation of Aquifers:

Review available groundwater data to evaluate beneficial uses and water quality standards. Identify beneficial uses of individual aquifers within hydrologic units. Beneficial uses of groundwater in the Colorado River Basin Region are currently based on hydrologic units. Revise Basin Plan as necessary.

Guidelines for Sewage Disposal from Land Developments:

Evaluate and revise the guidelines and the Basin Plan as necessary to account for population growth, distance to underground utilities, potential receptors, high-density housing developments, sewer versus septic wastewater disposal, and the need to prohibit septic systems, or limit their density. The current 1979 guidelines for sewage disposal do not consider these issues. Areas of concern include Yucca Valley, Twentynine Palms, Coachella Valley, Joshua Tree, and Pinyon Pines. This action should protect the quality and beneficial uses of groundwater with recent increases in total dissolved solids and nitrate from septic system wastewater discharges.

Remove Fecal Coliform Monitoring Requirement:

Remove fecal coliform monitoring requirement from the Basin Plan for discharges of wastewater treatment plant effluent, and focus monitoring on better pathogen-indicator organisms. Studies show that indicator organisms that correlate best with illness and disease are enterococci and *E. coli* for fresh waters, and enterococci for marine waters.

Re-evaluate Language in the Basin Plan Pertinent to the Salton Sea:

Assess and revise as necessary Basin Plan policies, plans, and guidelines developed to benefit water quality of the Salton Sea. These include beneficial use designations, water quality objectives, monitoring and water quality assessment, and implementation.

New River Pollution from Mexico:

Review the current Basin Plan policy addressing pollution in the New River at the International Boundary, and consider developing new strategies for Board consideration to expedite cleanup.

Standardize Imperial Valley Sediment TMDL Implementation Schedules -- Alamo River, New River, and Imperial Valley Drains:

Use the Alamo River Silt TMDL implementation schedule for the New River and Imperial Valley Drains Sediment TMDLs, as agreed to by the Imperial Irrigation District and Imperial County Farm Bureau.

Develop Region-wide Policy to Address Discharges of Agricultural Wastewater:

Develop a guidance for Palo Verde Valley and Bard Valley addressing nonpoint source pollution and incorporate the guidance into the Basin Plan.

Clarification of State Antidegradation Policy -- State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) Resolution No. 68-16, "Statement of Policy with Respect to Maintaining High Quality of Waters in California":

Expand Basin Plan discussion on SWRCB antidegradation policy to explain consistency with federal antidegradation policy and how the State Nonpoint Source Program implements the policy.

Sediment and Turbidity Water Quality Objective Implementation:

Develop guidance to implement and enforce water quality standards for sediment and turbidity for surface waters without sediment TMDLs and incorporate guidance into the Basin Plan. Implementation procedures for sediment and turbidity as they apply to TMDLs are outlined in Chapter 4 of the Basin Plan.

Develop Water Quality Objectives for Ammonia:

Review water quality criteria for ammonia and develop Basin Plan water quality objectives in accordance with current U.S. Environmental Protection Agency guidance.

Develop Water Quality Objectives for Residual Chlorine:

Review water quality criteria for residual chlorine and develop Basin Plan water quality objectives in accordance with current U.S. Environmental Protection Agency guidance.

Develop Water Quality Objectives for Biocriteria:

Evaluate the need for criteria for biological objectives and to develop Basin Plan water quality objectives in accordance with current U.S. Environmental Protection Agency guidance.

Correct Errors and Outdated Information, and Include Referenced Policies:

Correct errors and outdated information in the Basin Plan. The updates include, but are not limited to:

- Incorporating 2004 SWRCB policy to implement and enforce the Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Program;
- Expanding discussion of state antidegradation policy;
- Replacing "wastewater" with "waste" in the general surface water quality criterion for temperature; and
- Attaching policies referenced in Section 5 of the 2002 Basin Plan.

ISSUE 1: Beneficial Use Designation of Surface Waters

Staff proposes to conduct a region-wide surface water survey to evaluate beneficial uses and water quality standards. Staff will identify standards that require revision, reaffirm suitable standards that require no revision, and subsequently revise the Basin Plan as necessary. This process is part of the reaffirmation requirements for current water quality standards (WQSs). It is estimated that the amendment can be completed with 1.0 person-years (PYs) of additional staff resources.

BACKGROUND: The review of water quality standards (i.e., beneficial use designations and water quality objectives) is inherent to the Triennial Review process. A surface water survey should be conducted and a report should be prepared for incorporation into the Basin Plan. The report will be based on written comments and telephone surveys. Staff will solicit and receive public comments on the adequacy of beneficial use designations of surface waters of the Region. Incorporating changes into the Basin Plan may result in modifications to Tables 2-2, 2-3, and 2-4.

RECOMMENDATION:
Basin Plan Amendment: Draft a Basin Plan Amendment for Regional Board consideration.

Regional Board Hearing: Complete the procedural and substantive requirements necessary to conduct a Regional Board hearing to consider the Basin Plan Amendment.

RESOURCES REQUIRED: At least 1.0 PYs of existing staff resources.

PRIORITY: High

ISSUE 2: Beneficial Use Designation of Aquifers

Staff proposes to review available groundwater data to evaluate beneficial uses and evaluate water quality standards, and to identify beneficial uses of individual aquifers within hydrologic units. Beneficial uses of groundwater in the Colorado River Basin Region are currently based on hydrologic units. Staff will revise the Basin Plan as necessary.

BACKGROUND:

The beneficial use designations for ground water contained in the Basin Plan are presented in Table 2-5. These beneficial uses are designated on a hydrologic unit basis rather than on an aquifer basis. In other words, if a use occurs within a single aquifer in a hydrologic unit, the entire hydrologic unit is designated with the use.

TABLE 2-5: BENEFICIAL USES OF GROUND WATERS IN THE COLORADO RIVER BASIN¹

<u>Area Code</u>	<u>Hydrologic Unit</u>	<u>MUN²</u>	<u>IND</u>	<u>AGR</u>
Lucerne Valley Planning Area				
701.00	Lucerne hydrologic unit	X	X	X
702.00	Johnson hydrologic unit	X	X	X
703.00	Bessemer hydrologic unit			
704.00	Means hydrologic unit	X		
705.00	Emerson hydrologic unit	X		X
706.00	Lavic hydrologic unit			
707.00	Deadman hydrologic unit	X		
708.00	Joshua Tree hydrologic unit	X	X	
709.00	Dale hydrologic unit	X	X	X
710.00	Bristol hydrologic unit	X	X	X
711.00	Cadiz hydrologic unit	X	X	
712.00	Ward hydrologic unit	X		X
Hayfield Planning Area				
716.00	Rice hydrologic unit	X		
717.00	Chuckwalla hydrologic unit	X	X	X
718.00	Hayfield hydrologic unit			
Coachella Valley Planning Area				
719.00	Whitewater hydrologic unit			
719.10	Morongo hydrologic subunit ³	X		
719.20	Shavers hydrologic subunit	X		
719.30	San Gorgonio hydrologic subunit	X	X	X
719.40	Coachella hydrologic subunit	X	X	X
725.00	East Salton Sea hydrologic unit	X		X
Imperial Valley Planning Area				
723.00	Imperial hydrologic unit	X	X	
724.00	Davies hydrologic unit			
726.00	Amos-Ogilby hydrologic unit	X		
Anza-Borrego Planning Area				
720.00	Clark hydrologic unit	X		
721.00	West Salton Sea hydrologic unit	X		X
722.00	Anza-Borrego hydrologic unit	X	X	X

	Colorado River Planning Area (East Colorado River Basin)			
713.00	Piute hydrologic unit	X	X	X
714.00	Chemehuevi hydrologic unit	X		X
715.00	Colorado hydrologic unit	X	X	X
727.00	Yuma hydrologic unit	X		X

Footnotes for Table 2-5

1. Ground waters are important to sustain vegetation for wildlife habitat in some areas where surface waters are not present.
2. At such time as the need arises to know whether a particular aquifer which has no known existing MUN use should be considered as a source of drinking water, the Regional Board will make such a determination based on the criteria listed in the "Sources of Drinking Water Policy" in Chapter 2 of this Basin Plan. An "X" placed under the MUN in this Table for a particular hydrologic unit indicates only that at least one of the aquifers in that unit currently supports a MUN beneficial use. For example, the actual MUN usage of the Imperial hydrologic unit is limited only to a small portion of that ground water unit.
3. The term "hydrologic subunit" has the same meaning as the term "hydrologic area."

RECOMMENDATION:

Budget Change Proposal: Develop a Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Concept Paper for State Fiscal Year 2005-2006. If the concept is not approved, continue to pursue funding.

Review: Review all available groundwater data. This work could be completed by staff, or contracted.

Report: Synthesize collected data into a report (and perhaps a Geographical Information System database). This work could be completed by staff, or contracted.

Draft Amendment: Draft a Basin Plan Amendment for Regional Board consideration, recommending changes to the beneficial use designations of groundwater to correspond to individual groundwater aquifers within hydrologic units. The proposed changes also will be based on the review of "Sources of Drinking Water Policy" (State Water Resources Control Board Resolution No. 88-63). These changes would result in an updated version of Table 2-5 and a more detailed map of groundwater aquifers in this Region.

Regional Board Hearing: Complete the procedural and substantive requirements necessary to conduct a Regional Board Hearing to consider the Basin Plan Amendment.

RESOURCES REQUIRED: 1.0 – 2.0 PYs of additional staff resources.

PRIORITY: High

ISSUE 3: Guidelines for Sewage Disposal from Land Developments

Staff proposes to evaluate and revise the guidelines and Basin Plan as necessary to account for population growth, distance to underground utilities, potential receptors, high-density housing developments, sewer versus septic wastewater disposal, and the need to prohibit septic systems or limit their density. The current 1979 guidelines for sewage disposal do not consider these issues. Areas of concern include Yucca Valley, Twentynine Palms, Coachella Valley, Joshua Tree, and Pinyon Pines. This action should protect the quality and beneficial uses of groundwater with recent increases in total dissolved solids and nitrate from septic system wastewater discharges.

BACKGROUND:

Guidelines for sewage disposal from land developments were developed in 1979 and do not include considerations for population density, distance to underground utilities, or potential receptors. Effluent from septic tank/leachfield systems has been estimated to contain up to 70 mg/l of nitrogen (as nitrate), which poses a significant threat to groundwater quality. The need for updated sewage disposal guidelines is critical because septic systems are a significant source of nitrates and total dissolved solids in groundwater.

Septic system usage for sewage disposal is widespread in the Region. There are approximately twenty thousand systems in the Coachella Valley and eight thousand systems in the town of Yucca. The Regional Board currently regulates approximately sixty-five facilities, which equates to approximately three thousand systems. The estimated waterflow from septic systems in the Region is nearly seven million gallons per day.

The State Water Resources Control Board is currently working on statewide guidelines for On-Site Treatment Systems (OSTS). These guidelines will consider factors including, but not limited to, population density, soil factors, and setback distances. Staff proposes that the guidelines be reviewed/updated accordingly and incorporated through the Basin Plan Amendment process.

RECOMMENDATION:

Review:

Review all available data.

Report:

Synthesize collected data into a report.

Basin Plan Amendment:

Draft a Basin Plan Amendment for Regional Board consideration.

Regional Board Hearing:

Complete the procedural and substantive requirements necessary to conduct a Regional Board Hearing to consider the Basin Plan Amendment.

RESOURCES REQUIRED: 1.0 – 2.0 PYs of additional staff resources.

PRIORITY:

High

ISSUE 4: Remove Fecal Coliform Monitoring Requirement

Staff proposes to remove the fecal coliform monitoring requirement from the Basin Plan for discharges of wastewater treatment plant effluent, and focus monitoring on better pathogen-indicator organisms. Studies show that indicator organisms that correlate best with illness and disease are enterococci and *E. coli* for fresh waters, and enterococci for marine waters¹.

BACKGROUND: Studies have shown that other indicator organisms, besides fecal coliform, correlate best with illness and disease. Studies show that indicator organisms that correlate best with illness and disease are enterococci and *E. coli* for fresh waters, and enterococci for marine waters. Reference to Fecal coliform as an indicator should be eliminated from the Basin Plan.

RECOMMENDATION:
Review: Review relevant sections of the Basin Plan to determine which fecal coliform monitoring references should be deleted.

Basin Plan Amendment: Draft a Basin Plan Amendment for Regional Board consideration, recommending changes.

Regional Board Hearing: Complete the procedural and substantive requirements necessary to conduct a Regional Board hearing to consider the Basin Plan Amendment.

RESOURCES REQUIRED: At least 0.1 PYs of existing staff resources.

PRIORITY: Medium

¹ Marine waters are coastal waters with a TDS value equal to 35,000 ppm (sea water).

ISSUE 5: Re-evaluate Language in the Basin Plan Pertinent to the Salton Sea

Staff proposes to assess and revise as necessary Basin Plan policies, plans, and guidelines developed to benefit water quality of the Salton Sea. These include beneficial use designations, water quality objectives, monitoring and water quality assessment, and implementation.

BACKGROUND: Current information, guidelines, and policies related to the Salton Sea watershed are often changing due to current issues related to water transfer projects and the Salton Sea Restoration Project. Because the Salton Sea watershed is the Colorado River Basin Region's Priority Watershed, it is important for the Basin Plan to remain current in regards to Salton Sea issues (beneficial uses, water quality objectives, implementation plan, etc.).

RECOMMENDATION:
Review: Review relevant sections of the Basin Plan to determine which sections need to be updated.

Basin Plan Amendment: Draft a Basin Plan Amendment for Regional Board consideration, recommending changes.

Regional Board Hearing: Complete the procedural and substantive requirements necessary to conduct a Regional Board hearing to consider the Basin Plan Amendment.

RESOURCES REQUIRED: At least 0.1 PYs of additional staff resources.

PRIORITY: High

ISSUE 6: New River Pollution from Mexico

Staff proposes to review current Basin Plan policy addressing pollution in the New River at the International Boundary, and consider developing new strategies for Board consideration to expedite cleanup.

BACKGROUND: The New River at the International Boundary has long been subject to clean up programs, such as those described in the August, 1980 Minute No. 264, the April 1987 Minute No. 274, and the October, 1992 Minute No. 288 to the Mexican-American Water Treaty. The Colorado River Basin Regional Board has been consistently proactive towards improving water quality of the New River. Recently, however, it has become evident that new policy and new strategies may need to be pursued by the Regional Board to assist federal and local government in the expeditious clean up of the New River.

RECOMMENDATION:
Review: Review relevant sections of the Basin Plan to determine which sections need to be reconsidered and updated.

Basin Plan Amendment: Draft a Basin Plan Amendment for Regional Board consideration, recommending changes.

Regional Board Hearing: Complete the procedural and substantive requirements necessary to conduct a Regional Board hearing to consider the Basin Plan Amendment.

RESOURCES REQUIRED: At least 0.5 PYs of existing staff resources.

PRIORITY: High

ISSUE 7: Standardize Imperial Valley Sediment TMDL Implementation Schedules -- Alamo River, New River, and Imperial Valley Drains

Staff proposes to use the Alamo River Silt TMDL implementation schedule for the New River and Imperial Valley Drains Sediment TMDLs, as agreed to by the Imperial Irrigation District and Imperial County Farm Bureau.

BACKGROUND: Currently, three separate Implementation schedules exist for Imperial Valley Sediment/Silt TMDLs (Alamo River, New River, and Imperial Valley Drains). Regional Board staff discussed with Imperial Irrigation District and Imperial County Farm Bureau and agreed to use the Alamo River Silt TMDL Implementation schedule for all Sediment/Silt TMDL Implementation Plans in the Imperial Valley.

RECOMMENDATION:

Basin Plan Amendment: Draft a Basin Plan Amendment for Regional Board consideration.

Regional Board Hearing: Complete the procedural and substantive requirements necessary to conduct a Regional Board hearing to consider the Basin Plan Amendment.

RESOURCES REQUIRED: At least 0.1 PYs of existing staff resources.

PRIORITY: High

ISSUE 8: Develop Region-wide Policy to Address Discharges of Agricultural Wastewater

Staff proposes to develop a guidance for Palo Verde Valley and Bard Valley addressing nonpoint source pollution and incorporate the guidance into the Basin Plan.

BACKGROUND: The Basin Plan outlines a strategy for dealing with agricultural discharges of waste based on the 3-tiered approach to nonpoint source pollution control described in the State's Nonpoint Source Management Plan. With the recent adoption of the Nonpoint Source Implementation and Enforcement Policy, the 3-tiered approach is now obsolete (see Triennial Review Issue 14). The existing Basin Plan strategy to control agriculture runoff translates into (1) WDRs, (2) conditional waivers of WDRs, (3) discharge prohibitions, (4) TMDLs, or (5) a combination thereof. TMDLs are used to address water quality impacts on a priority basis in the Salton Sea Watershed (e.g. the Imperial Valley Silt TMDLs). In order for the Colorado River Basin Region to comply region-wide with the Nonpoint Source Implementation and Enforcement Policy, water quality control strategies for agriculture runoff must be developed and implemented for areas without current strategies in place, primarily Palo Verde Valley and Bard Valley.

RECOMMENDATION:

Investigate and Review: Begin background information and hydrogeologic data collection for effected areas.

Staff Report: Develop staff report(s) regarding agriculture runoff in the effected areas and potential strategies to comply with the Nonpoint Source Implementation and Enforcement Policy.

Basin Plan Amendment: Draft Basin Plan Amendment(s) for Regional Board consideration.

Regional Board Hearing: Complete procedural and substantive requirements necessary to conduct a Regional Board hearing to consider the Basin Plan Amendment(s).

RESOURCES REQUIRED: At least 1.0 PYs of additional staff resources.

PRIORITY: High

ISSUE 9: Clarification of State Antidegradation Policy -- State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) Resolution No. 68-16, "Statement of Policy with Respect to Maintaining High Quality of Waters in California"

Staff proposes to expand the Basin Plan's discussion on SWRCB antidegradation policy to explain consistency with federal antidegradation policy and how the State Nonpoint Source Program implements the policy.

BACKGROUND: The Basin Plan refers to the SWRCB antidegradation policy in Chapter 5 - *Plans, Policies, and Issues* as an applicable SWRCB policy. As requested by USEPA, discussion needs to be provided in Chapter 5 to explain the policy's intent; why the state policy is consistent with federal policy; how the State Nonpoint Source Program implements the policy; and how the Colorado River Basin Region implements the policy.

RECOMMENDATION:
Basin Plan Amendment: Draft a Basin Plan Amendment for Regional Board consideration.

Regional Board Hearing: Complete the procedural and substantive requirements necessary to conduct a Regional Board hearing to consider the Basin Plan Amendment.

RESOURCES REQUIRED: At least 0.1 PYs of additional staff resources.

PRIORITY: Medium

ISSUE 10: Sediment and Turbidity Water Quality Objective Implementation

Staff proposes to develop guidance to implement and enforce water quality standards for sediment and turbidity for surface waters without sediment TMDLs and incorporate guidance into the Basin Plan. Implementation procedures for sediment and turbidity as they apply to TMDLs are outlined in Chapter 4 of the Basin Plan.

BACKGROUND: Existing narrative sediment and turbidity water quality objectives are found in Chapter 3 of the Basin Plan. US EPA requests Regional Board staff clarify implementation and enforcement of sediment and turbidity standards in waters in the region without Sediment/Silt TMDLs. Guidance and/or policy on this topic need to be developed by staff.

RECOMMENDATION:
Basin Plan Amendment: Draft a Basin Plan Amendment for Regional Board consideration to incorporate new guidance/policy.

Regional Board Hearing: Complete the procedural and substantive requirements necessary to conduct a Regional Board hearing to consider the Basin Plan Amendment.

RESOURCES REQUIRED: At least 1.0 PYs of additional staff resources.

PRIORITY: Medium

ISSUE 11: Develop Water Quality Objectives for Ammonia

Staff proposes to review water quality criteria for ammonia and develop Basin Plan water quality objectives in accordance with current U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA) guidance and relevant state policies.

BACKGROUND: Water quality criteria for ammonia are not currently outlined in the Basin Plan. On December 22, 1999, US EPA published revised national criteria guidance for ammonia in the Federal Register. US EPA recommends adopting control levels for these non-priority pollutants suitable to protecting water quality and beneficial uses for waters in the region. US EPA requests that this issue be ranked as high priority for incorporation into our Basin Plan.

RECOMMENDATION:

Review: Review current US EPA water quality criteria guidelines.

Staff Report: Prepare a staff report that proposes an appropriate control level that protects beneficial uses.

Basin Plan Amendment: Draft a Basin Plan Amendment for Regional Board consideration.

Regional Board Hearing: Complete the procedural and substantive requirements necessary to conduct a Regional Board hearing to consider the Basin Plan Amendment.

RESOURCES REQUIRED: At least 1.0 PYs of additional resources.

PRIORITY: Medium

ISSUE 12: Develop Water Quality Objectives for Residual Chlorine

Staff proposes to review water quality criteria for residual chlorine and develop Basin Plan water quality objectives in accordance with current U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA) guidance.

BACKGROUND:	Water quality criteria for residual chlorine are currently not outlined in the Basin Plan. US EPA recommends adopting an appropriate control level for this pollutant suitable to protect water quality and beneficial uses of the Region's waters. US EPA requests that this issue be ranked as high priority for incorporation into our Basin Plan.
RECOMMENDATION:	
Review:	Review current US EPA water quality criteria guidelines for residual chlorine.
Staff Report:	Prepare a staff report that proposes an appropriate control level that protects beneficial uses.
Basin Plan Amendment:	Draft a Basin Plan Amendment for Regional Board consideration.
Regional Board Hearing:	Complete the procedural and substantive requirements necessary to conduct a Regional Board hearing to consider the Basin Plan Amendment.
RESOURCES REQUIRED:	At least 1.0 PYs of additional resources.
PRIORITY:	Medium

ISSUE 13: Develop Water Quality Objectives for Biocriteria

Staff proposes to evaluate the need for criteria for biological objectives and to develop Basin Plan water quality objectives in accordance with current U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA) guidance.

BACKGROUND: Water quality objectives for biocriteria are currently not outlined in the Basin Plan. US EPA strongly encourages the Regional Board to develop and adopt biological criteria for inclusion in our Basin Plan.

RECOMMENDATION:

Review: Review current US EPA water quality biocriteria guidelines.

Staff Report: Prepare a staff report that proposes an appropriate control level that protects beneficial uses.

Basin Plan Amendment: Draft a Basin Plan Amendment for Regional Board consideration.

Regional Board Hearing: Complete the procedural and substantive requirements necessary to conduct a Regional Board hearing to consider the Basin Plan Amendment.

RESOURCES REQUIRED: At least 1.0 PYs of additional resources.

PRIORITY: Medium

ISSUE 14: Correct Errors and Outdated Information, and Include Referenced Policies

Staff proposes to correct errors and outdated information in the Basin Plan. The updates include, but are not limited to:

- Incorporating 2004 SWRCB policy to implement and enforce the Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Program;
- Expanding discussion of state antidegradation policy;
- Replacing “wastewater” with “waste” in the general surface water quality criterion for temperature; and
- Attaching policies referenced in Section 5 of the 2002 Basin Plan.

BACKGROUND: The Basin Plan contains a few errors, typos, and outdated information. In addition, the Basin Plan does not include many of the policies that are referenced within the document.

RECOMMENDATION:
Basin Plan Amendment: Draft a Basin Plan Amendment for Regional Board consideration.

RESOURCES REQUIRED: At least 0.1 PYs of additional staff resources.

PRIORITY: High

SUMMARY

Issue	Priority	Required Resources
1. Beneficial Use Designation of Surface Waters	High	≥1.0 PYs of existing staff resources
2. Beneficial Use Designation of Aquifers	High	1.0 - 2.0 PYs of additional staff resources
3. Guidelines for Sewage Disposal From Land Developments	High	1.0 - 2.0 PYs of additional staff resources
4. Remove Reference to Fecal Coliform Monitoring	Medium	≥0.1 PYs of existing staff resources
5. Re-evaluate Language in the Basin Plan Pertinent to the Salton Sea	High	≥0.1 PYs of additional staff resources
6. New River Pollution from Mexico	High	≥0.5 PYs of existing staff resources
7. Standardize Imperial Valley Sediment TMDL Implementation Schedules – Alamo River, New River, and Imperial Valley Drains	High	≥0.1 PYs of existing staff resources
8. Develop Region-wide Policy to Address Discharges of Agricultural Wastewater	High	≥1.0 PYs of additional staff resources
9. Clarification of State Antidegradation Policy	Medium	≥0.1 PYs of additional staff resources
10. Sediment and Turbidity Water Quality Objective Implementation	Medium	≥1.0 PYs of additional staff resources
11. Develop Water Quality Objectives for Ammonia	Medium	≥1.0 PYs of additional staff resources
12. Develop Water Quality Objectives for Residual Chlorine	Medium	≥1.0 PYs of additional staff resources
13. Develop Water Quality Objectives for Biocriteria	Medium	≥1.0 PYs of additional staff resources
14. Correct Errors and Outdated Information, and Include Referenced Policies	High	≥0.1 PYs of additional staff resources
Total Resources Required		≥ 1.6 existing PYs; and ≥ 7.4 – 9.4 additional PYs